1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



26/LS 1W 5.8-04

1. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ACTION OF AUGUST 16, 2000

The Examiner's Action of August 16, 2000, refused entry a substitute specification filed April 11, 2000. Your applicant now files a substitute specification for application 09/041,685, entitled A LAMINAR FLOW INTERACTIVE OR VERTICAL VORTEX BIO MEDIA WATER TREATMENT DEVICE. The substitute specification, the claim amendments and the remarks are believed responsive to the Final Office Action dated August 16, 2000, to the Examiner's Advisory Action of April 16, 2003 and to comments by the Examiner during teleconferences between counsel and the Examiner. Examiner stated that the substitute specification filed April 11, 2000 was not entered because it did not conform to MPEP 608.01(q) which requires the submission of a marked-up copy which shows additions to and/or deletions from the original specification and that said proffered substitute specification did not conform to 35 CFR 1.125 which requires that applicants certify that there is no new matter, and moreover, that the specification was not entered because it was deemed by the Examiner to be replete with new matter.

Your applicant submits the following as a substitute specification flowing from the reordering of that which was submitted as the original application and the addition of text in the Specification flowing from the specification, drawings, claims as originally submitted, added claims 10-29 and new claims.

AMENDMENT, SUBSTITUTION AND CLAIMS FORMAT

The amendments and substitution pages are submitted in the new format. Hence, for each amendment to each distinct section of the application, a separate sheet will be

Certificate of facsimile Official Filing on September 11, 2003 to Office of Petitions with copy to Examiner Fred Prince

Application No. 09/041,685

26 27

28

Floyd E. Ivey.

G:UPClient/Weiss, Cullinan/PetitionRevival/Continuing Application, FINAL 030921, wpd



comments; b.) Amendments to the Specification; c.) Amendments to the Claims; and d.)
Remarks. It is observed that for claims, all claims will be displayed where any amendment is made to any claim. Amendments to claims shall be shown by strike through for deletions and underlining for additions. Amendments to the specification will be by strikeout and underlining. No separate "clean" version is provided for either amendments to claims or specification. In this Continuing Application, Request for Reconsideration and Petition to the Commissioner and Response to the Examiner's action, the application is set forth as a substitute application. The source supporting each amendment to either claims or specification is from that originally submitted with the original application re: specification and claims and as derived from an examination of the drawings.

CERTIFICATION OF NO NEW MATTER

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125, it is certified that no new matter has been added by this submitted substitute specification. The substitute specification is submitted in a marked up format. The additional text is drawn from a review of the drawings as originally submitted comprising Figures 1 through 11. Deriving additional description of the invention from the drawings is recognized as proper and it is contended here that no new matter has been added.

The test of the right to make counts is to be found in the total disclosure. Thus, the omission of a written description in the specification of an application will not necessarily prevent the reading of a count on a structure shown in the drawing and described in general terms in the specification. Here, the function of the disclosed structure is inherent in the structure shown in the drawings forming a part of the application. Woofter v. Carlson, 367 F.2d 436, 441, Cust. & Pat.App. 1966;

Certificate of facsimile Official Filing on September 21, 2003 to Office of Petitions

with eopy to Examiner Fred Prince

Floyd E. Ivey.

Application No. 09/041,685

3

8

6

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

aminer Free Prince

Carlson v. Nagata, 480 F.2d 1372, 1375-76; Cust. & Pat.App.,1973

The inventors are Max V. Weiss, 407 Skidoo Bay, Polson, Mt. 59860 and Terry J. CULLINAN, P.O. Box 2725, Missoula, Mt. 59806 are as disclosed in the original application.

A new Declaration was filed March 20, 2003 in accordance with the requirements of the Examiner.

This REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE DISMISSAL OF THE PETITION FOR REVIVAL AND CONTINUING APPLICATION IS ACCOMPANIED BY A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION OF AUGUST 16, 2000 is being filed by facsimile transmission to FACSIMILE #703-308 6916 with a copy to Examiner Prince at fax 703 872 9709; telephone number 703 306 9169.

The applicant respectfully observes that your applicant made payment of \$650 for

a small entity, on March 20, 2003, and that the PTO 2038 form for payment by Credit Card was included with that prior transmission. Your applicant respectfully observes that this filing is in the third month with respect to the dates set by either the Examiner's Advisory Action of April 16, 2003 or the Dismissal of April 21, 2003 and requests

Application No. 09/041,685

(PetitionRevival\Continuing Application, FINAL, 03092), wpd

mile Official Filing

2003 to Office of Petitions

Extension in Filing within the third month with the fee for extension comprising \$465. Additionally, the fee for a Continuing Application is \$375 payable. Fees totaling \$840.00 are now submitted via the PTO 2038 forms for payment by Credit Card which are included with this transmission. The Office of Petitions will find PTO 2038 authorization for \$420.00 for Mr. Cullinin and PTO 2038 authorization for \$420.00 for Mr. Weiss.

Certificate of facsimile Official Filing on September 21, 2003 to Office of Petitions

with copy to Examiner Fred Prince

by Floyd E

Application No. 09/041,685

hiPetitionRevival/Continuing Application.FTNAL030921.wpd